

LIVERPOOL CLASSICAL MONTHLY (LCM) Volume 8 Number 7 July 1983

Edited and published from Liverpool by John Pinsent, MA DPhil.,
Dept of Greek, The University, PO Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX,
who is the sole proprietor and to whom, addressed by name, sub-
scriptions, and contributions on any subject of classical interest,
should be sent, and to whom, also by name only, cheques and checks
made payable.

RATES p.a. of 10 issues (not August and September)

SURFACE £4 UK & Europe, \$(US)10 elsewhere

AIR £5.50 Europe, \$(US)20 N.America, \$(US)25 Australasia

CONTENTS, the copyright of which remains in each case with the author,
and is so secured at the end of each article.



A.K.FRANGOULIS(Athens): <i>Sophocles</i> , Electra 610-11	98
J.D.CLOUD(Leicester): <i>Plautus</i> , Bacchides 437-450	99-100
WILLIAM M.CALDER III(The University of Colorado at Boulder): <i>Suetonius</i> , Claudius 28	100
JOAN BOOTH(Swansea): Double-entendres in <i>Ovid</i> , Amores 2.2	101-102
Reviews: JUDITH P.HALLETT(Brandeis u./U. of Maryland at College Park)	102-108
J.N.Adams, <i>The Latin Sexual Vocabulary</i> , London, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd/Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins U.P., 1982, Cloth, pp.272, £24.00/\$27.50. ISBN 0 7156 1648 X	109-110
H.D.JOCELYN(Manchester)	110
Milan, Università degli Studi di Milano, Istituto di Filologia Classica, <i>Scripta Philologica III</i> , Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino - La Goliardica, Milan 1982, pp.241, tabb.9, paper. Price L.18,000	110
TOM RASMUSSEN(Manchester)	111
Marissa Bonfante, <i>Out of Etruria. Etruscan influence North and South</i> (BAR International Series 103) Oxford 1981. Pp.173, 10 maps, 122 figs. Buckram, price £10.00. ISBN 0 86054 121 5	112
ROBIN OSBORNE(King's College, Cambridge): <i>Beans mean ...</i> (Τηλεμάχου χύτρα)	111
DEVELIN(Tasmania): <i>The treason of Hipparchos</i> (Lykourgos, Leokr.117-118)	112

This number of *LCM*, the last before the summer break for which the Editor at least is so grateful as almost to have perpetrated the cliché (or employed the formulaic adverb) 'profoundly', even if, for reasons which he need not specify (A level marking *inter alia* - that is, for readers abroad, the marking, at high speed but with, he hopes, accuracy, the public examination upon which entry to British Universities mostly depends - Greek Literature, that is, Set Books), his labours will not cease for a week or two. And then, of course, there will be the promised DOUBLE NUMBER to prepare for October. However, he will be sustained in such labours by the remarks of a new subscriber who is 'glad to have a complete file of your enterprising and stimulating publication' - even if 'stimulating' is not always a word of unalloyed praise in reviews - and goes on to say:

There is certainly a real need for the *LCM*, and I hope it will not become fossilized by offering more and more of what we already have too much of in the conventional classical journals. Let us have more short critical articles which prove something worth knowing and leave the mere assemblage of facts to other publications. I for one welcome a healthy polemic which reveals real differences in approach, taste or values. Does the general lack of genuine polemic in classical studies nowadays prove that we have become more urbane or simply that we don't really care? You can certainly contribute to an enlivening (or resuscitation?) of classics by allowing the *LCM* to be piquant where more staid publications would doubtless hedge.

Well! The Editor could hardly have written a better policy statement himself. He had supposed that what went into *LCM* depended as much upon his contributors as upon himself, but he begins to suspect that *LCM* has acquired 'a certain reputation' (see the reference to it on p.103), and that contributors self-select at least the kind of contribution that they think suitable for it. It is odd to feel that he has imposed (his own?) distinctive character on the journal, but on the evidence readers (and contributors) seem to like it.

He must remark on the extraordinary coincidence that vol.7 no.7 (July 1982) contained an equally long review on the same pages 102-108, and one equally controversial - for he knows that the character of the journal has sometimes tempted reviewers into writing with - call it greater freedom than they might do for staid (not staidier, for *LCM* is not staid at all) journals. Let us hope that this review contains healthy polemic as well as contributing a distinctively American flavor which makes the Editor at least think of the *New York Review of Books*. He could not resist the temptation (as well as making a cross-cultural comment on p.107) to preface the review with two articles which make reference to the book reviewed and indeed deal with matters (which he must be careful not to associate with any particular place) with which it also deals and which have not of late much appeared in the pages of *LCM* (incipient fossilization?).

But he must not allow the unbuttoned style of these notes (which reflects the relief he feels at typing the last page of the last number before the summer recess) to leave him no space for this month's apology - for an error which fortunately seems to have caused its victim more amusement than pain. For his feminism (see again p.107) led the Editor, by a kind of reversal of the old Married Woman's Property Act, to attribute the article of D.C.Braund(Exeter) to his wife S.H.Braund(Exeter). This is perhaps an argument for married women publishing under their maiden names, or for the (American) use of first, given or even Christian (baptismal?) names. In the same misattributed article he had failed to fill in a deleted mistyping on p.89 line 18, which should end with the words 'analysis of Cicero's treat-'.
It is evidence of the good will of contributors and subscribers which convinces the Editor that the Editorial policy of *LCM* remains on the right lines. He leaves the challenge implicit in the first extract which he printed above to contributors, and he hopes that they will make as good use of the vacation as he hopes to himself (an index???) by writing for him 'short critical articles which prove something worth knowing' or, if proof is too much to hope for in our discipline, perhaps some healthy polemic.

During the meeting of Electra with her mother the chorus are justifiably restrained; they intervene only once. The speech of Electra which precedes their intervention is graduated in temper; she ends it with an angry reproof of Clytemnestra's behaviour and deeds (605-9). The Chorus comment

ὄρω μένος πνέουσιν· εἰ δὲ σὺν δίκη
 εὔνεστι, τοῦδε φροντίδ' οὐκέτ' εἰσορῶ. 610-11

This couplet is a very disputed point of literary criticism, and its function has been a subject for debate. There are two questions at stake, a) who is the speaker? and b) who is being spoken about?. Although the MSS testify that the Chorus are speaking here, there are those who attribute the line to Electra (e.g. A.D. Fitton-Brown, *CQ* ns6[1956], 38-9) or even to Clytemnestra (D.J. Lilley, *CQ* ns25[1975], 309-11). The fact that there are no examples of similar choral comments in tragedy that do not respond to what the Chorus have just heard makes me agree with the MSS. G.H.R. Horsley does indeed suggest that 310f. in this play is such an example (*LCM* 5.6[Jun.1980], 128), but that is not a conventional comment bridging two opposing speeches, as this is, but an introduction to a quite extensive conversation between the Chorus and Electra.

Discussion of the second question, who is being spoken about?, will show that the Chorus' comment is well suited to the spirit of the whole scene. Scholars offer three different interpretations. The majority apply the words to Electra. So Jebb, noting that the Chorus-leader has once before reproved Electra's vehemence (213-20), R.D. Dawe, reviewing Kamerbeek's commentary in *Gnomon* 48(1976), 232, but reading τῆςδε for τοῦδε, J.E. Harry, *CQ* 5(1911), 178, and N.B. Booth, *CQ* ns27, 466-7. Others support the view that the Chorus here have Clytemnestra in mind. So Kamerbeek takes her as the subject of πνέουσιν: the Chorus, seeing her rage at Electra's last words to be indicated by her gestures, address Electra. He follows Campbell, Kaibel and others on this point, which is maintained also by D.B. Gregor, *CR* 64(1950), 178, and J.H. Kells, who suggests in his edition (Cambridge 1973) that σὺν δίκη refers sarcastically to Clytemnestra's claim to be on the side of justice. Likewise Fitton-Brown, who argues that it is incredible that the Chorus' only comment on the debate between mother and daughter should be a rebuke to Electra, and Horsley, who says that 'a public rebuke of Electra by the Chorus in Clytemnestra's presence would emphasize that Electra is entirely lacking in support, while she offers no hint that she feels herself deserted even by those women she knows are sympathetic'. Finally some scholars divide the couplet into two parts. Bayfield (1901) makes Electra the subject of πνέουσιν and Clytemnestra that of εὔνεστι, δίκη referring to her treatment of Electra. Paley (1887) gave a similar explanation: the Chorus address the queen, first commenting on Electra's attitude to her mother and then on Clytemnestra's to her daughter. The Scholiast too thinks that Electra is the subject of πνέουσιν, but that in φροντίδ' οὐκέτ' εἰσορῶ the Chorus hint in veiled terms at Clytemnestra.

After so many general and particular treatments of the problem it may seem difficult to say something that is both original and true! But I think that even though Clytemnestra takes up the word φροντίς in her response to the words of the Chorus (which Horsley thinks supports the view that she detects that their ambivalent comment is directed at her), it is more natural for the lines to be taken by the audience as referring to the attitude of Electra. The Chorus' words can only be interpreted in the light of the general situation, and of the tactics they have applied up to this point. It is universally admitted that this Chorus, as participant in the plot, strongly sympathize with Electra, with whom they have a familiarity that seems to have been cultivated before the play begins. At 254f. Electra almost apologizes before the Chorus, which is very unusual for Sophoclean heroes (cf. C.H. Whitman, *Sophocles, a study of heroic humanism*, Cambridge, Mass., 1951. 165), and this is suggestive of the quality of this familiarity. But this Chorus provides something more; what Electra lacks in the enthusiasm of her youth and the despair of her situation: they are the embodiment of the prudence and ἀσφαλὴ which is necessary for the prosperous outcome of the common purpose. Their objective is to deter Electra from undertaking the act of vengeance herself, for on the one hand they believe that some other power is taking care of it, and on the other that the business is beyond a woman's strength (I have treated the dramatic role of this Chorus at greater length in my Liverpool Ph.D. thesis, 1977, pp.85-100).

S.M. Adams, *Sophocles the playwright*, Toronto 1957, characterizes the Chorus at this moment in the evolution of the play as 'sympathetic and alarmed'; they sympathize with Electra, but they are anxious because they see her revealing an extravagantly vehement passion which they have been unable to moderate. The presence of Clytemnestra strengthens their anxiety. It is, then, natural that they should not speak plainly when they should not be siding with a disputant but taking a middle course (Horsley remarks the 'deliberate ambiguity' of the Chorus here, p.127). We should not translate εἰ δὲ σὺν δίκη | εὔνεστι, with Jebb, as 'whether Justice be with her': for the Chorus are not questioning whether her concern with revenge is just: they have clearly defined their position in the first stasimon at 475-6 εἰσὶν ἃ πρόμαντις | Δίκη, δίκαια φερομένα χερσὶν κράτη. The subject of πνέουσιν is certainly Electra, but that of εὔνεστι is neither her nor Clytemnestra, but the outrageous attitude of the former as implied by μένος πνέουσιν. The substance of the Chorus' words is that this kind of behaviour opposes Electra's just aims; they are anxious because they see (εἰσορῶ) that Electra does not care (φροντίδ') whether her excessive behaviour promotes her righteous aims or not. I find a similar expression in Aeschylus, *Septem* 671 Δίκη, εὐνοῦσα πατὶ παντόλμῳ φρένας, with the sense 'attending on, favouring', LSJ⁹ σύνειμι 3. The anxiety of the Chorus makes sense if we take into consideration Chrysothemis' revelation in the preceding scene (378-84). Clytemnestra takes up the word φροντίδ' with a different sense (Harry thinks it is not in answer to the Chorus, but to her daughter's final declaration): she seems to say: if Electra does not care to moderate her attitude, why should I take care of one who is so young and has insulted her mother.

Scholars usually also adduce *Antigone* 471-2 δηλοῖ τὸ γούν λημ' ὤμων ἐξ ὁμοῦ πατρός

τῆς παιδός· εἰκεῖν δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται κοινῶς, apparently an-

other conventional bridge between two speeches, but one which in fact very closely resembles this one. Especially characteristic of both is that they are not personally addressed to either of the opposing persons. The Chorus in the *Antigone* express their anxiety for Antigone as that in the *Electra* does for Electra. The attitude of both seems to frustrate the Chorus' hopes for a better evolution of things, and in both cases the words of the Chorus surely reflect the attitude also of the audience at this point in the play.

Philoxenus - *senex* Lydus - *paedagogus* Mnesilochus - *adulescens* Mnesilochus overhears Lydus' complaints to the elderly Philoxenus over the brutal insolence of the young of today towards their teachers.

PH. *alii*, Lyde, nunc sunt mores. LY. *id equidem ego certo scio*
nam olim populi prius honorem capiebat suffragio
quam magistro desinebat esse dicto oboediens;
at nunc, prius quam septuennis est, si attingas eum manu, 440
extemplo puer paedagogo tabula dirumpit caput.
cum patrem adeas postulatum, puero sic dicit pater:
'noster esto, dum te poteris defensare iniuria'.
prouocatur paedagogus: '*eho senex minimi preti,*
ne attigas puerum istac causa, quando fecit strenuue'. 445
tit magister quasi lucerna uncto expretus linteo.
itur illinc iure dicto†. hocce hic pacto potest
inhibere imperium magister, si ipsius primus uapulet?
 MN. *acris postulatio haec est. cum huius dicta intellego,*
mira sunt ni Pistoclerus Lydum pugnis contudit. 450

I was led to this passage in the course of an investigation into the range of meanings available in early Latin for *prouoco* and its cognates. The dictionaries assign two meanings to *prouoco* in Plautus - 'call out (of a house)' and 'challenge (to some contest)'. The first sense fits *Mil.* 1122 and *Pseud.* 638, the second *Cure.* 355, *Epid.* 665, *Stichus* 770 and *Truc.* 954, if *prouocatur* there were correct, though *prouocator* = 'challenger' is doubtless right. OLD places the *prouocatur* of our passage in the first category, but the *paedagogus* is not being called out of the house or even his room; he is on the spot already complaining to the *pater familias* of the battery inflicted on him by the latter's precociously violent little boy. So, whatever *prouocatur paedagogus* means, it cannot mean 'the tutor is called out (of his room, house)'. I was therefore forced to look at the context in which the anomalous use of *prouoco* occurred, and at once it became clear that from 442 to 449 the tutor's complaint to the father is couched in terms appropriate to an aggrieved would-be plaintiff seeking leave of the praetor to bring an *actio iniuriarum* and being refused such leave. The comedy lies in the incongruity between the majesty of the law and the facts of the case, and also between the dignified institutional role of the *praetor/pater* and what he actually says and does. The point was at least partly taken by Weise in his edition of 1847, commenting on 447: *illinc itur, tamquam a praetore, iure dicto*, but consciousness of Plautus' little joke explains several puzzles.

1. *postulatum* is generally translated 'to complain' or something similar; thus Nixon 'to protest', Augello 'a lamentarti', Ernout 'reclamer'; but there is little evidence for *postulo* = *expostulo* in Plautus, mss. and edd. preferring *expostulare* at *Mil.* 515, if not (with Leo) assuming a lacuna. However (cf. TLL 1-621. 35-65, s.v. *adeo*) *adeo* and *postulo* are the technical terms for approaching a magistrate and requesting leave to bring an action or prosecution (for *postulare* in the required sense cf. *lex tabulae Bantinae* 9-10). So an accurate translation of *cum ... postulatum* would be 'when you approach papa for permission to prosecute'. *postulatio* at 449 is presumably a pun on the legal sense of the word; cf. Terence, *Hecyra* 180-181 *neque lites ullae inter eas, postulatio | numquam*.

2. *te ... defensare iniuria*, where *iniuria* has to mean 'from assault', is very odd Latin. The simple ablative with *defendo* or *defenso* normally indicates the instrument by which the defence is effected, and in fact, if TLL is to be believed, there are no other examples of *defenso* + simple ablative in the sense of 'defend from', as opposed to 'defend with', until Fulgentius. *ab iniuria* is what one would expect as in Sallust, *Cat.* 35.6 (*defendo*) and subsequently *Cod.Theod.* 7.8.5 (*defenso*). Why then the extraordinary ablative? I think there are two reasons; firstly, there is a pun on the other meaning of *iniuriā*, namely 'wrongfully', and the pun would not work otherwise; secondly - and this brings me to the third point - there is probably a deliberate attempt to parody the stereotypical wording of the *legis actio sacramento* procedure. Cf. Gaius, *Inst.* 4.16 *quando tu iniuria uindicasti, quingentis assibus te prouoco*

3. *prouocatur* is a puzzle, and it may be that a reader of LCM can help. If *prouocatur* is used by Plautus principally because it evokes the primordial wording of the *legis actio*, then perhaps it is a mistake to look for strict sense at all. Possibly it means 'the tutor is called forward' - *uocatur ut prodeat*, to adapt Ussing's paraphrase - and one would expect *prouocatur* to mean something etymologically possible or else to suggest by assonance the sense which the dramatist wants it to bear. Less likely possibilities are: 1) 'The tutor is challenged', i.e. 'The tutor's case is disputed', but it is impossible to parallel this use of *prouoco* before the 2nd century A.D.; 2) 'Et l'on menace le précepteur' (Ernout) or 'The tutor is refused'. But what similar sounding word bears either of these in themselves acceptable senses?

4. I don't wish to add much to what has already been written about 446-447, except to point out that the obeli must cover the first half of 447 as well as 446. 446 is wholly incurable: not only do we not know what *expretus* means or hides (and the fatuous comment of Paulus p.69L., *quasi expertia habita*, if it goes back to Verrius Flaccus, suggests that the meaning was unknown as early as the Augustan age), but we cannot even guess at the image, for *uncto ... linteo* could qualify the *magister*, the *lucerna*, or both. It would help to emend *lucerna* to *lacernā*; the hiatus would be less offensive and the image at least comprehensible. The tutor departs, his *disruptum caput* muffled in embrocated bandages like a cloak. For cloaks wrapped round the head cf. Horace, *Sat.* 2.7.54-55 *prodis ex iudice Dama | turpis, odoratum caput obscurante lacerna*, of the lover emerging furtively from some matron's house. If this suggestion is on the right lines (and *lucerna* and *lacerna* are often confounded in manuscripts, e.g. in the Horace passage just cited), then *expretus* will mean or conceal some equivalent of *obuolutus*, but this is as far as I can go.

However, *itur* in 447 is intolerable after *it* in 446, and fairly disagreeable if the *it* is emended to some other verb, e.g. *fit*. We don't want an impersonal expression; the spotlight is on the *magister* throughout. Leidlolph in 1883 proposed *ita* for *it* and *agitur* for *itur*, running the two sentences together - ingenious, but Plautus does not share Leidlolph's passion for resolving the initial trochee into a tribrach: the nearest ones

appear to be at 430 and 463. One by itself would pass, but two in successive lines draw attention to themselves in an undesirable way. Thierfelder, *de rationibus interpellationum Plautinarum* (192()), 91-2, maintained that the corrupt line and a half (446 and 447a) was an actor's interpolation. This is a more plausible explanation of 447a than it is of 446: performers who could make nothing of 446 deleted it from their acting copy and substituted *itur illinc iure dicto* for whatever Plautus wrote to provide Lydus' speech with the connecting link it required. If this hypothesis is correct, we shall never arrive at Plautus' text - even recovery of more of the *Dis exapatōn* would scarcely help so Roman a passage. But one thing is clear, even if 447a is interpolated, the interpolator was aware of the pervasive legal imagery and, by his choice of *iure dicto*, of its connexion with the praetor's jurisdiction.

I have not quite finished with this passage, for it has a little to contribute to two questions which have exercised the student of the early history of Roman private law.

The first concerns the term *iniuria*. It is odd that a word whose meaning in untechnical usage, supported by its etymology, is a wrong, should have acquired the technical sense of assault, though the history of the word 'trespass' affords an English legal analogy. Hence arguments about the meaning of *iniuria* in the XII Tables, some holding that it covered all forms of assault, e.g. Mommsen, *Strafrecht* 836-7 '*die traditionelle Meinung*' and M. Kaser, *Das römische Privatrecht*² (1971), 156 n.13, others that it was used only of minor batteries, as Pugliese, *Studi sull'iniuria* (1941), 5-14, and most recent scholars, like R. Wittmann, *Die Körper-Verletzung an Freien im klassischen römischen Recht* (1972), 11-12, and P. B. H. Birks, *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 37(1969), 163-200 esp. 188-9, that it was not used at all *specialiter* of assault. Our passage at least shows that by c.189, to accept the customary dating of *Bacchides*, *iniuria* was used as a legal term for assault. On the other hand, *iniuria* occurs 37 times in Plautus, and despite the fact that people are always threatening to hit one another in his plays I can find no other place where *iniuria* is used to characterize this activity, though Pinacium in *Mostellaria* 898-9 refers to his battering upon a door as *maxima iniuria*: '*heus, ecquis hic est, maximam qui his iniuriam | foribus defendat?*', and there is a similar image at *Rudens* 414. From this I infer that, although *iniuria* = 'assault' was part of the language of the law, this sense of *iniuria* was felt to be very much a lawyer's sense; laymen, when not taking off the law, will use other words, e.g. *uis* or the gerund of *uapulo*. In that case, *iniuria* as a legal umbrella for assault, even minor batteries, can hardly have been knocking around the Latin language since 450 B.C.. So Birks' heterodoxy receives some support.

Secondly, when did the praetor's edict begin to matter? In the case of the *edictum generale on iniuria* the litigant's position was ultimately altered in three ways: 1) the *legis actio* was replaced by the more flexible *formula* procedure; 2) the system of *talio*, composition or fixed fines prescribed by the XII Tables was replaced by the awarding of appropriate damages; 3) *iniuria* was extended to include psychological as well as physical assaults upon the personality. This last development is certainly much later than the lifetime of Plautus, but 1) probably but not necessarily entails 2); the more sophisticated *formula* provides the framework for the estimation of damages. Here the Plautine evidence speaks with an uncertain note; in our passage the combination of probable parody of the *legis actio* wording and *iniuria* context would suggest that the *formula* had not yet taken over in the field of assault and battery. On the other hand, at *Asinaria* 371 a slave utters the words '*pugno malam si tibi percussero*', which are so strikingly close to the standard pattern of the relevant *formula*, '*quod ... Aulo Agerio pugno mala percussa est*', that they can hardly be anything but an echo. In view of recent doubts I emphasize the point - the collocation of words is so uncharacteristic of Plautus as to point unmistakably to parody. Firstly, Plautus normally uses *pugnis*, as at 450, not *pugno* as ablative of instrument, naturally enough as only one-armed men normally use a single fist; there are 22 examples of *pugnis* and only one other textually certain example of *pugno*, *Miles* 26, where it has point, since the *miles gloriosus* is being flattered by a reference to the occasion when in India he shattered an elephant's *bracchium* with (one) fist! Secondly, this is the only example in Plautus of *percutere* with *pugno/pugnis*, or, for that matter, of *percutere* with *malam*. The echo of the *formula* can therefore scarcely be an accident.

I suggest a possible explanation. The *formula* had not completely replaced *legis actio*; the wording of the *formula* suggests that it was intended in the first instance to apply to the least serious form of battery for which the XII Tables fine of 25 *asses* had become derisory. But the tutor's *disruptum caput* surely puts his injury into the graver XII Tables category of *membrum ruptum* for which they already prescribed *talio* or composition, neither of which would be affected by successive depreciations of the *as* in the way that fixed fines were.

Copyright (C) 1983 J.D. Cloud

WILLIAM M. CALDER III (The University of Colorado at Boulder): Suetonius, Claudius 28

LCM 8.7 (Jul. 1983), 100

Suetonius reports of Claudius (Claudius 28): *libertorum praecipue suscepit Posiden spadonem, quem etiam Britannico triumpho inter militares viros hasta pura donavit.*

The *hasta pura*, a spear without its metal tip (Varro *apud* Servius *ad* Virgil, *Aen.* 6.760 = II.108 6-8 Thilo-Hagen) was the oldest and originally the only *donum militare*: see H. O. Fiebig, *RE* 14(1912), 2508-9, and G. R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier* (Bristol 1969), 115-6.

Why would Claudius have presented Posides, no soldier, with this decoration?

J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (Baltimore 1982), 19-20 with 20 n.1, documents *hasta* in the sense *mentula*: cf. *OLD* s.v. *hasta* *1b. purus* = 'chaste' is attested often: see *OLD* s.v. 5.

Castrated Posides' *mentula* was *pura* of necessity: hence the decoration, amusingly appropriate on other than military grounds.

For another imperial pun on the same subject see Suetonius, *Vesp.* 23.1, cited at Adams 19.

Copyright (C) 1983 William M. Calder III

I am grateful to Professor F.R.D. Goodyear for comments on a draft of this paper.

Dr J.N. Adams declares at the beginning of his learned and useful new book *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London 1982; hereafter cited as Adams) that he has kept all 'fanciful speculation' out of it because he has 'no sympathy with the current mania for discovering obscene *double-entendres* in unlikely places' (pre-face p.vii; cf. pp.32-3). Neither have I. But I must protest at the absence of any recognition of indecent double-meanings in Ovid, *Amores* 2.3. For here is the least unlikely of places - a poem about a eunuch by an author whose love of *double-entendre* in general and *risqué double-entendre* in particular is well-known; here, indeed, I would say, perception of a series of sexual double-meanings, largely based on usages analysed by Adams, is essential for the appreciation of the poem. Most of these double-meanings have nevertheless also gone unremarked by commentators on the *Amores*, and though A.G. Lee, among the translators, at least indicates that he is aware of *double-entendres* in 2.3 (*Ovid's Amores*, London 1968, 187), he does not identify or explain them. So perhaps it is time that someone did.

Both *Amores* 2.3 and the immediately preceding poem are addressed to a eunuch-slave who will not allow Ovid access to the pretty mistress he chaperons (some scholars believe that *Amores* 2 and 3 form a single poem accidentally divided in transmission, but I doubt it; in any case, the issue is not material to the present discussion). In *Amores* 2.2 Ovid attempts to win over his addressee by pointing out to him, reasonably civilly, what he stands to gain by abetting his mistress in her infidelities to her *uir*, and what he can expect to suffer if he informs on her instead. In our poem, after this approach has apparently failed, he changes his tack and tries again:

ei mihi, quod dominam nec uir nec femina seruas,
mutua nec Veneris gaudia nosse potes.
qui primus pueris genitalia membra recidit,
uulnera quae fecit debuit ipse pati.
mollis in obsequium facilisque rogantibus esses, 5
si tuus in quauis praepetuisset amor.
non tu natus equo, non fortibus utilis armis,
bellica non dextrae conuenit hasta tuae.
ista mares tractent: tu spes depone uiriles
sunt tibi cum domina signa ferenda tua. 10
hanc imple meritis, huius tibi gratia prosit;
si careas illa, quis tuus usus erit?
est etiam facies, sunt apti lusibus anni;
indigna est pigro forma perire situ.
fallere te potuit, quamuis habere molestus: 15
non caret effectum quod uolueris duo.
aptius at fuerit precibus temptasse: rogamus,
dum bene ponendi munera tempus habes

The general nature of the change of tack is clear enough: after avoiding all direct reference to his addressee's peculiar physical disability in *Amores* 2.2, where we know that he is a *castratus* only because he is called *Bagous* - or *Bagoas* - (the name was one borne by several notorious Persian eunuchs; see L. Alfonsi, *Latomus* 23[1964], 349, and 28[1969], 207-8), Ovid now proceeds to play on it at length. He begins in vv.1-6 by attributing the chaperon's unco-operative attitude to his inability to make love to a woman himself, and this passage, despite its veneer of sympathy, has on the whole been recognized for what it is - a cruel reminder of the sensitive aspect of the eunuch's condition. The hurtful explicitness of *nec uir nec femina* (v.1) is unmistakable, and the double-edged nature of the enclosing *dominam ... seruas* (not only 'You guard the lady of your house' but also, ironically, 'You keep a mistress by you') has generally been perceived too. What has not generally been perceived is that Ovid continues in vv.7-10 to mock the eunuch's inability to function sexually.

When Ovid tells his addressee in vv.7-8 'You are not cut-out' (*natus* has to be understood very loosely) 'for riding; you are no good with powerful weapons; the spear of war is out of place in your right hand', he might appear simply to be jeering at the lack of physical strength from which effeminate of all kinds are liable to be assumed to suffer - the battlefield is obviously no place for weaklings. But a poor sort of gibe it would be which merely taunted a man with physical inability to do what he might never have the chance to - anyway: Ovid's addressee may, or may not, be a runt, but he is certainly a *slave*, and no-one of servile status could count on being able to follow a military career (slaves were enlisted in the Roman army only as a last resort; see P.A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower 255 B.C. to A.D.14*, Oxford 1971, 64, 418-20, 474, 499-500, 648-51). The real point of Ovid's insistence on the eunuch's inability to handle a horse and weapons of war begins to become clear only when one remembers that both equestrian and military metaphors are common in Greek and Latin allusions to sexual intercourse.

The equestrian metaphor is most frequently found applied to the *schema* in which the woman is positioned astride the man, she being designated 'rider' and he 'horse' (e.g. Ovid, *Ars* 3.777-8

*parua uehatur equo: quod erat longissima, nunquam
Thebaïs Hectoreo nupta resedit equo;*

see further Adams 165-6). But there is evidence to suggest that it could also be used when the positions were reversed (Aristophanes fr.329K. ἀναβῆναι τὴν γυναῖκα βούλομαι may be added to Adams' citations on p.166). Ovid's *non tu natus equo* in v.7 will thus serve as a sly and malicious reminder of the eunuch's unfitness for sexual, no less than military, 'riding'.

One of the most well-established of the many forms of military metaphor which appear in erotic contexts is the use of words for weapons, not least among them *arma* and *hasta*, to denote the penis: see e.g. Martial 6.73.6 (the speaker is Priapus) *nec deuota focis inguinis arma geram*, Ausonius, *Cent. Nupt.* 117P. *intorquet summis adnexus uiribus hastam* (Adams collects more examples at pp.19-22). Thus, by telling the eunuch here that he is *non fortibus utilis armis*, Ovid is able to suggest that he is useless not only with military

weapons but with the male sexual 'weapon' too (for a similar Ovidian play on *arma* cf. *Am.* 1.9.25-6

*nempe maritorum somnis utuntur amantes
et sua sopitis hostibus arma mouent.*);

fortibus and *utilis* contribute to the *double-entendre*, *fortis* being capable of the meaning 'full of sexual vigour' and *utilis* of that 'potent' in the sexual sense (cf. Ovid, *Am.* 2.10.27-8

*saepe ego lascivae consumpsi tempora noctis,
utilis et forti corpore mane fui.*).

And when Ovid claims in v.8 that *bellica hasta* is not suited to the eunuch's right hand, I think he means to imply, climactically, that his penis - the 'spear' of *bellum amoris* - will not even respond to manual stimulation (castration did not necessarily involve the loss of the penis; see Adams 70 n.1, Courtney on Juvenal 6.731-2). The *left* hand, certainly, is the one usually associated with masturbation (Adams 209), but the right is obviously just as capable of it, and *dextra* supports the double meaning far better than *laeva* here.

The *double-entendre* continues in v.9, where the eunuch is advised to 'let real men' (*mas* is virtually a technical term for 'a sexually potent male'; cf. Catullus 16.13 *male me marem putatis?*) 'handle those things' (*ista ... tractent*) and to renounce *spes uiriles*. This 'leave-well-alone' advice is neatly made to cover both war and sex: *ista* relates back to *equo*, *arma* and *hasta*, whose implications have already been discussed, and *spes uiriles* is nicely ambiguous, for 'male ambition' exists not only on the battlefield but also in the bed. And though the *double-entendres* in these lines are not strictly dependent on any sexual meaning in *tractare*, the verb is, in the context, mildly suggestive in itself, for it is often used with reference to masturbation, and its compounds are used also of various other kinds of sexual (see Adams 186, 208).

In v.10 Ovid turns again to military metaphor. His words appear to suggest simply that duty to his mistress must, for the eunuch, take the place of duty as a soldier. But, as every student of Latin poetry knows, *love* is often portrayed (especially by the Augustan elegists) as a form of soldiering, and the lover depicted as a carrier of standards - either his own (e.g. Ovid, *Am.* 2.12.14) or Cupid's (e.g. Ovid, *Am.* 2.9a.3); and so, in telling his addressee that the most he can hope for is to 'carry standards' at his mistress' side, Ovid reminds him that he is a non-combatant in the war of love as well as in war proper.

So much for vv.7-10. Were I not entirely convinced of the presence of *double-entendres* in those lines, I should be inclined to dismiss detection of double-meanings in vv.5-6 and 11-12 as 'fanciful speculation' but as it is I think it more than likely that Ovid intended *double-entendres* at these points too.

In vv.11-12 Ovid appears to be advising the eunuch, innocuously enough, to ply his mistress with favours because she is the only person to whom he can be of any use. But *implere* (v.11) can mean 'to make pregnant' as well as 'to ply with' (e.g. Ovid, *Met.* 6.111 (*ut Iuppiter impleret gemino Nyctei da fetu*), and it seems reasonable to suppose that *usus* (v.12) could, like *utilis* (above), denote specifically sexual 'usefulness'. So I would venture to translate 'Serve her with favours ... without her, how can you be of "service" at all?' ('serve', the popular agricultural word for 'inseminate' is particularly apt, given that *implere* in its sexual sense is most frequently used of fertilization of the female by the male animal (see Adams 207)).

In vv.5-6 I suspect that it was Ovid's intention to tease his readers with hints of prurience which come to nothing. *mollis* (v.5) seems to presage a conventional gibe, for it was a standard derogatory epithet of effeminate males (e.g. Ovid, *Ib.* 454, Plautus, *Aul.* 422), but when it is followed by *in* + accusative it becomes clear that it can only mean here 'easily persuaded into'. Anticipation of a lewd joke is raised afresh, however, by the very next words, for *obsequium* may denote sexual compliance (e.g. Livy 39.42.9 *ut obsequium amatorum uenditaret*, and cf. Curtius 10.1.25), *facilis*, readiness to grant sexual favours, and *rogantibus*, those who seek them (e.g. Ovid, *Ars* 3.475 *neque te facilem iuveni promitte roganti*); it looks as if Ovid is going to accuse his addressee of being all too willing to participate in perverted sex, but then the pentameter reveals that he is merely expressing the view that the eunuch would be more sympathetic to lovers who request access if he had ever been in love himself (cf. Ovid's frustration of the reader's expectations at *Am.* 2.63-4). Claudian's phraseology at *Eutr.* 1.363-4 *lenis facilisque moueri | supplicibus mediaque tamen mollissimus ira*, where the subject of comment is again a eunuch, bears some resemblance to Ovid's in v.5, and indeed the whole passage *Eutr.* 1.358-70 recalls *Am.* 2.3 in its sustained use of sexual *double-entendre*; possibly Claudian saw in Ovid's poem what later generations of readers have missed.

I would not claim that *Amores* 2.3 is one of the most appealing or arresting of Ovidian elegies. The average modern reader will see in it and *Amores* 2.2 a self-consciously literary treatment of a situation which means little to him. I would claim, however, that 2.3 is, by virtue of the *double-entendres* I have discussed, a wittier and more pungent piece than it is generally taken to be.

Copyright (C) 1983 Joan Booth

Review: JUDITH P. HALLETT (Brandeis U./U. of Maryland at College Park) LCM 8.7 (Jul. 1983), 102-108
J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd/Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins U.P., 1982, Cloth, pp. 272, £24.00/\$27.50. ISBN 0 7156 1648 X

Professor Mainwaring come into the room waving a letter in his hand. He was elegantly dressed in a lightweight suit of American design and his beard was newly trimmed.

'What do you think about this?' he asked [Minnie Foresight] has taken exception to an article Fairfax has written in one of the learned journals' ...

'Really?' Miss Clovis looked puzzled. 'I wonder which article it can have been? I can't remember anything that could have offended her.'

'Oh, it is nothing personal - it is just that she considers Fairfax's article obscene.'

'Obscene?' Miss Clovis spat out the word indignantly. 'But it's a perfectly straightforward account of the initiation ceremonies of the tribe he studied - the seclusion of the boys and girls in the bush - the coming forth - the dancing, and the licence allowed in certain forms of behaviour, with a rough translation of the songs they sing ...'

'Evidently Fairfax's translation was too rough.' chuckled Professor Mainwaring. 'We must remember that our patroness is not an anthropologist.'

'What does she say?'

Professor Mainwaring handed over the letter, and Miss Clovis read such phrases as 'deeply distressed', 'most shocking', 'unpleasant details'.

'Well, she obviously has no idea how important it is that every detail should be known.' said Miss Clovis bluntly.

'Quite, but I do feel that Fairfax has perhaps been a little over-zealous on this occasion. And what a pity he is such a poor Latinist!'

'There seem to be some Latin phrases here' said Miss Clovis, turning the pages of the article.

'Yes, he knows *ad hoc* and even *primus inter pares* - that much he will have imbibed at his red brick university." Here the Balliol man in the Professor could not help coming out and showing itself for a moment. 'He is not an Oxford man, you know, or even a Cambridge man. Everything that has offended poor Minnie could have been put into Latin and she would have been quite satisfied. Some women have a great veneration for the classical tongues. Yes', Professor Mainwaring plucked at his beard and paced round the room, 'the Latin of Petronius Arbiter or another of the great Silver Latin poets ...' He gave an extravagant sigh, as if his thoughts were back in those elegant days of decadence. 'I could have turned this very prettily into Latin if only Fairfax had consulted me, but of course he did not. I'm afraid it would not have occurred to him to do so. Gervase is a dear boy, but humility is not one of his virtues.'

'It does seem an odd use for Latin', said Miss Clovis thoughtfully, 'to avoid giving offence to those who probably cannot understand it anyway. I suppose Greek could be used too.'

'Indeed, it has been. My own study of certain unusual relationships in a primitive society had a good deal of Greek in it, and I believe it was Greek to a good many people. Did I not give you an offprint? - 1911 or 1912 I think it was published.'

'No, you didn't'. It seemed unnecessary to point out that she would have been only eight or nine years old at the time."

Barbara Pym, *Less than angels* (London 1955, 1978/New York 1982), 94-5

(I would like to thank Phyllis Culham of the U.S. Naval Academy for drawing this book to my attention;

see the Women's Classical Caucus Newsletter 8[Spring 1983], 7)

In 1931, the same year that A.E. Housman brought his Classical Paper '*Praefanda*' in *luminis oras*, an American Latinist, R.F. Thomason, came out with *The Priapea and Ovid. A study of the language of the poems*. Unlike Housman's essay, Thomason's book had been written in plain English, and printed in its author's own country; indeed, it was published in Nashville, Athens of the South and emerging spiritual heartland of the re-United States. Even more unlike Housman's essay, however, Thomason's book - its proclaimed focus on language notwithstanding - made no effort to illuminate descriptions of sexual parts and practices, despite the ubiquity in the *Priapea* and prominence in Ovidian verse of such passages. Indeed, Thomason attempted to prove that Ovid composed the *Priapea* without ever bothering to acknowledge that many of the similar passages in the *Priapea* and Ovid, passages which he cites as evidence for Ovidian authorship of the former, deal with matters of a sexual nature.

Thomason's reticence on these matters characterizes other American studies of Greek and Roman erotica as well. See, for example, an earlier volume published by the same U.S. press that published Adams' book: David M. Robinson and Edward J. Fluck, *A Study of the Greek Love Names. Including a Discussion of Paederasty and a Prosopographia*, Baltimore 1937. It refers, for example, to acts involving one partner's ejaculation as 'ultimate obscenity' (p.14) and translates the Greek word *ἐρωτικός* as 'dissolute knave' (p.38, quoting the B.B. Rogers translation of a passage from the *Clouds*). But it does not stem solely from the same American prudishness that banned *Lady Chatterley* (and even writings of Henry Miller, a native son) from our shores. U.S. classicists of Thomason's time regarded frank, detailed and learned explication of Latin (and Greek) texts which treat sexual endeavour and equipment as the province of scholars abroad; U.S. classicists nowadays still tend to do so. And while German scholarship has a prior, and well earned, claim on such investigative territory, ever since Housman's '*Praefanda*' - and especially since Dover's *Clouds* commentary and the birth of *LCM* - U.S. classicists also think of it in cartographic pink, as under British control. What is more, the assumption that numerous British scholars, Oxbridge and red brick, share the fictive Professor Mainwaring's expertise, both passive and active, on sexual description in the Greek and Latin tongues has of late been joined by a heartening observation: that what the editor of this journal has termed 'the new climate of permissiveness' (*LCM* 6.5[May 1981], 120) has enabled several such scholars to integrate such expertise into a fuller elucidation of Greek and Roman linguistic convention, literature and culture.

Yet even though the U.S. classics community may deem such scholarship traditionally an un-American activity, originally Teutonic and increasingly British, we have harboured great expectations of it, and responded enthusiastically to its appearance and findings. Recent testimony to these expectations and this response was to be witnessed in the book display room at the 1982 American Philological Association meeting (held the last days of December in that centrally-situated, proverbial cradle city of American *libertas*, Philadelphia, and thus particularly well attended). From the moment the display room opened, book-browsing traffic bottlenecked at the table occupied by the Johns Hopkins University Press. At first a notice listing J.N. Adams' *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* seemed to constitute the attraction; two days into the meeting a copy of Adams' book itself surfaced, and explained as well as added to the throngs. Your reviewer's own vigorous efforts to look the volume over briefly, which she defended to the press representative by her invitation to review (and failure to receive) the volume, were, for example, strictly timed and limited in the name of fairness to others: these, numerous, others were, moreover, audibly demanding a peek and a handle (and in some cases - to judge from the appearance of the display copy as time and classicists went by - having a full-fledged fondle).

The interest, and welcome, accorded Adams' book at the APA gathering were doubtless intensified by Peter Howell's witty review in the *Times Literary Supplement* the week before Christmas (December 17, 1982, 1386), and by Howell's assessment of the book's major value. For it can hardly be coincidental that the only other table in that display room enjoying as brisk a business belonged to the Oxford University Press. To be sure

the Yankee nose for a bargain played its part in the crowding of both tables: the Oxford Press people were hawking the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* at a convention discount price of \$116, a 20% (and \$29) saving; Hopkins is retailing the U.S. edition of Adams for almost \$10 less than the British edition would cost at the current, dollar-favouring, sterling exchange rate. But Howell's hailing of Adams' book as an 'invaluable' reference work must also have motivated many to contemplate investing in it as a treasured companion volume to the newly completed *OLD*. Specialists in such areas of research as Latin erotic poetry, Pompeian graffiti and Roman medical writings might in fact do well to purchase Adams in duplicate: after a few months' residence with your reviewer, her own much-consulted copy is starting to resemble that on the Hopkins Press table at convention's end.

One might, though, do better to wait for a revised, second, edition of *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* before buying that second copy. As both Duckworth and Hopkins dust jackets asseverate, Adams attempts to undertake a 'systematic investigation of evidence provided by both non-literary and literary sources from the early Republic down to about the fourth century A.D.' for Latin sexual terminology: words for sexual parts and practices. Yet Adams has omitted from this volume material presented in three of his recent - and extremely important - articles: in *BICS* 27(1980), *Glotta* 59(1981) and *Phoenix* 35(1981) respectively. Unfortunately, some of the university libraries frequented by your reviewer do not subscribe to some of these journals; in those libraries which do subscribe to all three, precisely those numbers of *Glotta* and *Phoenix* that contain these Adams papers are being bound, and hence at this moment unobtainable. Presumably the bound periodical volumes will be resting on the stack shelves ere long; even so, it would help to have all relevant evidence and discussion collected together in a revised and expanded edition. So, too, Adams' appendix on 'the vocabulary related to bodily functions' arbitrarily restricts itself to words for defecation, urination and expulsion of intestinal gas; an enlarged version in the next edition should submit to similar scrutiny the Latin vocabulary of vomiting, perspiration, the exuding of bodily odours and other functions which also relate anatomically and aesthetically to sexually-utilized organs, and to sexual union itself.

Your reviewer judges its consideration of Latin words and expressions in a larger linguistic context the most attractive and helpful feature of *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. By supplying Greek precedents and parallels, Romance reflexives and post-fourth-century Latin exempla as well as analysing classical Latin usage, Adams goes far beyond his stated aim of 'describing and classifying' 'varieties of language used in Latin to refer to sexual parts of the body, sexual acts and excretion' (p.vii). The presence of this Greek, Romance and later Latin material, and Adams' habitual integration of it into his presentation of classical Latin vocabulary, enable the reader to obtain an enhanced sense of how Latin words and expressions of this sort seem to have developed and evolved in imaginative literature, colloquial speech and scientific discourse. Adams could, however, have made things somewhat easier for the reader by adhering more scrupulously to a diachronic presentation of his classical Latin data; the book's value as reference work and *OLD* companion renders his cavalier attitude toward chronology quite irritating.

To be specific. In his discussion of the 'titillating' function of obscene language (pp.7-8), Adams first adduces and summarizes Martial 11.16.5ff. (*o quotiens rigida pulsabis pallia vena ...*) and 1.35.10-11 (*lex haec carminibus data est iocosis, | ne possint, nisi pruriant, iuvare*); he concludes with the words 'Cf. Catullus 16.9'. But inasmuch as Catullus 16 provides a far earlier comment on how lascivious verses can titillate than do these two poems by Martial, and since these two poems by Martial pointedly evoke Catullus 16.9 (*et quod pruriant incitare possunt*; Catullus 32.11 *pertundo ... palliumque* and 56.7 *rigida mea cecidi* are arguably being recalled by Martial as well), Adams should have preceded his remarks on Martial with a fuller explication of Catullus on linguistic titillation.

Adams' subsequent comments (pp.9ff.) on the tone of the word *mentula* frustrate no less: he starts out with citations from Martial and the *Priapea*, then moves to the celebrated passage from Cicero, *ad familiares* 9.2, which should by all rights and (chrono-)logic have begun this discussion (along with the eight appearances of *mentula* in Catullus treated on pp.11-12). The section on 'eating' metaphors for *fututio* and *pedicatio* on pp.139ff. maddeningly intersperses Catullan uses of the metaphor (for *fellatio* as well as for the latter) with - in that order - examples from Ausonius (for deflorational *fututio*), Pompeian inscriptions and the *Perusinae glandes* of 41-40 B.C.; some examples from Martial (for cunnilingus and *fellatio*) then follow. Later, when presenting evidence that Latin words for 'joke, play' often served to denote or at least suggest sexual acts (pp.161ff.), Adams commences with later Romance reflexes and classical Latin appearances of *iocari* and *iocus* (with illustrations first from Ovid, then the elder Pliny and the Vulgate, and lastly Catullus). This paragraph ought to have followed the two paragraphs which come after it, on *ludo* and *lusus*, which start with an example from Terence and end with some instances from Cicero and Martial (and sandwich some from the elder Seneca, then Catullus, and then Petronius, in between); regrettably, Adams has omitted Suetonius' uses of *ludere* and *illudere* at *Tiberius* 44-45. On pp.172-3 his discussion of the metonymic euphemism *mentulam caco*, Adams fails to mention Lucilius 967, the earliest Latin passage supporting his own interpretation of the phrase, until after he has supplied what he deems relevant passages from the *Priapea*, Martial and Juvenal.

Adams' a-chronological approach to Latin literature can prove as annoying as that to the Latin literary language. His section on the linguistic conventions of comedy (pp.218-9) begins with Greek New Comedy and Terence, and picks up on Plautine practice thereafter. Yet Adams misses a crucial point by this *hysteron proteron* literary historicizing: Terence's failure to employ vivid sexual metaphors, especially in jokes, would seem especially significant in the light of Plautus' (previous and noteworthy, if relatively infrequent tendency to do so. Adams' own failure to assign a date to the *Priapea* at the outset of his volume gives particular grounds for frustration: only at the end of the book (p.220), by discussion these verses after those of Catullus and Martial in his 'Catullus and epigram' summary, does he even hint at his (totally undefended) preference for their composition (by a single author) subsequent to Martial's epigrams. One misses citation of Vincenz Buchheit, *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum* (Zetemata 28), Munich 1962, and its arguments for an early second century A.D. date for the *Priapea*.

More meticulous concern with chronology, and with deliberate echoes of earlier Latin authors by later ones, would not only benefit Adams' readership. It might also aid Adams' efforts to comprehend some rather difficult lexical items, and to ascertain whether or not veiled sexual description lurks therein. One thinks of his professed vexation, on pp.49-50 and later on p.140, with the Scholia to Juvenal 2.53 (*luctantur paucae, comedunt coloephia paucae*), which interpret *coloephia*, 'meat cuts' (eaten in particular by athletes) as a term

for the *membrum virile*. Finding no grounds for this interpretation, Adams is left with allowing that the scholiast 'was led astray by *comedunt*, in which he may have seen the common metaphor of 'eating' the genitalia'. But Adams might better understand both *colyphia* and the scholiast's interpretation as responses to Martial 7.67, which Juvenal would appear to be evoking, and whose negative portrayal of tribadism as connected with 'masculine' female athletic activity the female speaker of Juvenal 2.49-53 would appear to be challenging. For there Martial described the masculine *tribas* Philaenis as vomiting wine and devouring sixteen meat chunks (12 *cum colyphia sedecim comedit*) after wrestling sessions, then refusing *fellare* because she thinks the act *parum virile* (and hence performing cunnilingus instead). By way of contrast, Juvenal's Laronia compares women favourably to male pathics by emphasizing that females do not lick each other (49 *Tedia non lambit Cluviam nec Flora Catullam*) and only a few women engage in wrestling and athletic meat-eating (53). Were Adams to consider Juvenal's literary point of reference, and the possibility that the scholiast was alluding to it, Juvenal's intended meaning and the scholiast's comment might become less opaque.

On a larger, generic, scale, Adams' aforementioned discussion of 'Catullus and epigram' suffers from his treatment of Catullus, Martial and the *Priapea* as if they were poetic entities operating independently of one another, and neglect of two crucial (and chronologically significant) facts: a) that deliberate Catullan echoes play a major part in the sexual word-play of both Martial and the *Priapea* and that so many similar verbal descriptions occur in Martial and the *Priapea* as to render pointed allusion by one to the other an important feature of these epigrams (regardless of whether one thinks Martial or the *Priapea* came first - cf. the reference to Vincenz Buchheit above p.104). Thus Adams misses a distinctive element of sexually referential Latin epigrams as an evolving genre: its playful self-definition and validation by appeal to other, earlier, descriptions of the parts and practices in question, and to the reader's recall of these descriptions. This particular section suffers no less from Adams' exclusive concern with the frequency and distribution of basic obscenities (as opposed to their metaphorical and euphemistic substitutes) in epigram. He also needs to concern himself with the placement of obscene words, and the combination of obscenity and euphemism, in both individual epigrams and entire authors. Such *Priapea* as 3, 8, 9, 20, 23 and 29 rely upon the shock value of an obscenity for the humour of their punchlines; this epigrammatic technique of postponing the obscenity (and often relying upon veiled sexual language up to the punchline) needs to be compared to that of using obscene words earlier on - and at times repetitively - in the poem (cf. Catullus 16, or Augustus' *sex versus* quoted by Martial 11.20, or Martial 11.78, which is unlike the kindred *Priapea* 3 in *flashing mentula* in line 2, *pedicare* at 5, and *cunnius* in 10). A fuller knowledge of how, and where, Catullus, Martial and the *Priapea* employ obscenities may in fact afford more clues to the dating of the *Priapea* and should certainly illuminate stylistics of sexual description in the genre of epigram.

Inter-generic as well as intra-generic relationships between similar sexually descriptive passages would be more fully illuminated by a consideration of chronological precedence, and deliberate literary echoing, too. The section on 'Personification and animal metaphors' (for the penis, pp.29-34) needs to note that the Latin literary portrayal of the organ as having an eye does not originate with Martial 9.37 (nor for that matter with Martial 2.33, an earlier epigram Adams here neglects: there Martial asserts that kissing the *calva*, *rufa* and *lusca* Philaenis is *fellatio*, and hence equates her with a penis. Martial 3.92, which evidently uses *oculos* ... *duos* as meaning *testiculos*, is also relevant in this context - and neglected by Adams). It may also be significant that we find it previously at Petronius, *Satyricon* 132, an echo of *Aeneid* 6.469 (*illa sola fixos oculos aversa tenebat*). For echoes of epic descriptions having nothing sexual about them frequently occur in the sexual descriptions of the *Priapea* (e.g. 25 and especially 68); the role of epic parody in euphemistic, personifying sexual descriptions deserves greater attention - for elucidating the literary tradition behind the *Cento nuptialis* of the euphemistic (even in epigram) Ausonius if for no other reason.

Perhaps one might object at this point to your reviewer's own, and according to the visiting Alexis de Tocqueville (*Democracy in America*, edited and abridged for the modern reader by Richard D. Heffner, New York 1956, 156-8), incurably and typically American, obsession with perfectibility - with how Adams might improve his book in a later edition. The lumping together of Adams' shortcomings in linguistic, and inadequacies of literary, discussion may give special offence. After all, Adams has delimited his aims as linguistic description and classification of the Latin sexual vocabulary. He did not set out to chart the evolution (or inter-relationships) of Latin literary genres, or to determine the date of the *Priapea*. As a matter of fact Adams avows that he has 'tried to keep the book free from fanciful speculation' since he has 'no sympathy with the current mania for discovering obscene double entendres in unlikely places' (p.vii). Yet at the same time Adams justifies his undertaking as 'of both literary and semantic interest', as illuminating 'the conventions of a genre, the tastes of its exponents, and the tastes of the age in which a literary work was composed'. And achieving such illumination requires a sensitivity to the larger literary as well as the larger linguistic context, and a recognition that distinguishing literary from linguistic contexts can prove extremely difficult.

Besides, Adams does speculate, often fancifully, throughout the book; he would not, therefore, compromise any scholarly principles in hazarding guesses, in the face of incomplete evidence, on how Latin epigram evolved and when the *Priapea* were composed. On exiguous evidence, he asserts that 'it is highly likely that basic obscenities had an important place in apotropaic verses' (p.4) and that Catullus based his invective on 'real life' and 'presumably introduced' basic obscenities to the genre of epigram (pp.11-12); that *cunnius* can signify, pejoratively, the *culus* of a male pathic (p.116), and that *fututus* is used as a substitute for *pedicatus* (p.120). In examining humorous metaphorical uses of *fututrix* (p.122), he not only postulates that *fututrici manu* seems to signify sodomizing at Martial 11.22.4 (although the reference is to manual arousal of a boy's *mentula* and has nothing to do with penetration: Adams does not entertain the notion that *fututrici* here = *ut fututricis*, like a woman who needs an aroused *mentula* to be *fututa*, and that the word makes comic capital out of the feminine gender of *manus*). He also defends this hypothesis by citing Martial 11.40.3-6, 'where the implication may be that Glycera was *fututam ore*': he thus interprets *futuo* as *fello* without considering whether Martial means that Glycera has to arouse Aelianus by *fellatio* before he can have the erection necessary for *fututio*. Adams maintains the existence of 'abundant evidence' that 'the *pedicatus* was considered to *cacare*, or to defile, the *mentula* of the *pedicator*' (pp.172-3); he then proceeds to supply evidence merely to the effect that *pedicatores* were laughed at (in poetry and graffiti) for placing their *mentula*

in the place where *merda* dwells - and does so with the admittedly speculative statement 'other passages which definitely or possibly have the same point'. Some of this evidence, moreover, may not even belong in the 'possible' category: Martial 9.69 may well imply that if Polycharmus *cacat* after he *fuit*, then he urinates (rather than becoming *cacatus*) after he becomes *pedicatus*.

To be sure, Adams refrains from linguistic speculation when the reader would cheer him on. A propos of the similarity between the euphemistic word *veretrum* = penis (pp.52ff.) and instrumental nouns for agricultural implements and bodily parts such as *aratrum* (from *arare*), *rostrum* (from *rodere*) and *rastrum* (from *radere*), it does not seem unreasonable to posit its derivation from *vereor*: the analogy of *rostrum* = human nose (already in Plautus) warrants note, as does the frequent depiction of penile endeavour by words for sowing, ploughing and other agricultural activity (see p.154). One would also like to see Adams address the speculative argument that *pedicare* does not derive from Greek *παύω*- words, but from (or with) Latin *podex*. For if Adams is willing to indulge in linguistic speculation over the 'second element' of *masturbari* - that '*stuprare* is the best candidate so far put forward' (pp.210-11) - surely these more plausible conjectures demand his attention too.

Contrary to the observation of de Tocqueville (*Democracy in America*, p.143 of the edition cited above) - that 'the Americans do not read the works of Descartes because their social condition deters them from speculative studies' - speculation occurs with great frequency in the researches of classical scholars on these shores, some of it fanciful (and, in the Cartesian tradition, French-inspired). But even though classicists here may not share Adams' avowed (if not strictly observed) abhorrence of the practice, they do place a high premium on accurate translations, paraphrases and representations of Latin literary texts: Adams' varied inaccuracies of this sort, and concomitant misconstructions of various Latin literary contexts, for that reason may constitute a more urgent area for amelioration and revision to accommodate American sensibilities. Passages from Martial seem especially vulnerable to such misrepresentation and construction. When maintaining that obscene language was supposed to be titillating, Adams cites as evidence Martial 11.60.7, because it stresses 'the importance of words as an accompaniment to intercourse'. Its phrase *nec vocibus ullis* | (*adiuvant*), though, simply means 'sounds of encouragement' and need not signify obscene words; *voce iuvare* at Martial 11.104.11 is similarly misinterpreted. Adams' later statement on p.8 that Martial 1.35.4f. likens 'the pleasure a woman receives from her husband's *mentula* to that conferred by the word' (*mentula*) needs rethinking: is not *mentula* being employed as a metaphor for Martial's plain-spoken and bawdy poems? In claiming (on p.9) that Martial 11.15.8ff. implies the term *mentula* to have been used in the time of King Numa, and hence to be akin to Anglo-Saxon four-letter words, Adams misses the mark: Martial emphasizes not the antiquity of the word, but its acceptability in speech - the fact that even a holy (*sanctus*) old-fashioned Roman (cf. 1.2 *Catonis uxor* | ... *Sabinae*) spoke it freely; here Martial associates the word *mentula* metonymically with his own poetry as well. On p.14 Adams refers to Martial 7.35 and 55 when he alleges that 'Jews were considered to be well-endowed and lustful': both poems portray Jewish men as the former, but neither implies the latter.

Martial is not, however, alone in enduring such misreading and misrepresentation. In his *Addenda* (p.255), Adams gives Plautus, *Casina* 465 (*hi conturbabunt pedes*) as further evidence for 'the feet in [heterosexual] intercourse, a matter treated on p.180. Plautus, however, is describing a homosexual coupling (and perhaps even the 'intercrural position' discussed and illustrated in Dover's *Greek Homosexuality*, London/Cambridge Mass. 1978, 98ff. & plates B114, B250 and B486). Adams states (on pp.170-1 & 196-7) that Catullus 74 portrays Gellius' stern *patruus* as using the word *deliciae* itself disapprovingly, and does so as if reporting on actual behaviour rather than on epigrammatic characterization (p.171 'The stern uncle ... spoke against *deliciae*. At this time the word no doubt took its tone from the tone of voice of its user'). Catullus, however, merely characterizes this *patruus* as formerly chastising 'if anyone were to say or do pleasurable things'.

Pace Adams (p.216), we are not to regard the lusty Quartilla's reference to Giton's organ with the diminutive *vasculum* at Petronius, *Satyricon* 45.7 as evidence for her observing of linguistic propriety, and for a 'standard Roman attitude that obscenity was unfit for the ears (and mouths) of children'. For one thing, the word *vasculum* occurs in the narrator Encolpius' remarks about, and not Quartilla's remarks on, this occasion. As Adams might also have noted elsewhere in this concluding chapter, nary an obscenity is to be found in the euphemistic *Satyricon*; the point of this scene is, moreover, that Quartilla considers the twelve-year-old Giton and seven-year-old Pannychis ready for 'grown-up' sexual things. So, too, Adams' assertion on p. - that the freedman said, at *Satyricon* 45.7, to have 'pleasured' (*delectaretur*) his mistress was also motivated 'to obtain pleasure himself' and boastfully if implicitly touted his own virility - has absolutely no basis in Petronius' text. Adams is no less guilty of misconstruing his evidence for what one might call the 'transtextual and authorial' connotations of various words. On the evidence he offers, he simply cannot maintain (as he would on p.120) that *futuo* is used affectionately in various graffiti, or that Catullus 32 (with its request for nine continuous *fututiones*) is an affectionate address to Ipsitilla. Nor can he argue, as he would on pp.127-8, that *irrumo* can be used as a neutral (rather than as an aggressive) word when uttered to females in private.

Howell's review calls attention to Adams' own stern, unsmiling, tone, contrasting it with his (British) publisher's schoolboy joke on the blurb. The Hopkins dust jacket has replaced this *jeu de mots* - acclaiming the book as 'fundamental in every sense' - with 'this is a unique reference work for anyone interested in the ancient world and is unlikely to be superseded for some time to come'. Though it is possible that we are to understand 'supersede' in the light of what Adams says about *sedeo/eedes* (pp.165 & 241) and 'come' *sub specie obcaenitatis*, it is equally possible that no one cares if Adams' U.S. readership is not amused: de Tocqueville would, after all, have regarded 'American *jeu d'esprit*' as an oxymoron if ever one was - witness the chapter in *Democracy in America* entitled 'The Example of the Americans Does Not Prove that a Democratic People Can Have No Aptitude and No Taste for Science, Literature or Art' (IX), or his statement on p.251 of the edition cited, that 'democratic people cannot have aristocratic manners', [and] 'neither comprehend nor desire them' 'for in order to feel that refined enjoyment which is derived from choice and distinguished manners, habit and education must have prepared the heart'.

Your reviewer holds the opinion that scholarly exegesis of the witty (and to Barbara Pym elegantly decadent) Latin authors in whose writings so much sexual vocabulary appears should at times adopt a style befitting its subjects, much as Sir Ronald Syme does in his *Sallust* and *Tacitus* (a reviewer addicted to Barbara Pym, though, may not typify American tastes). Still, even if Adams is more comfortable with dry exposition and

to be forgiven his stylistic preferences, he should be more sensitive to the humour and irony of his Latin sources. From his reference on p.19 to a witty literary pastiche - the *Cento nuptialis* of Ausonius - as 'the most protracted misinterpretation extant of epic lines' to his overly literal interpretation of Plautus' and Martial's tongue-in-cheek labellings of farting a *flagitium* (p.250), Adams displays discomfort with the efforts of Roman (and Greek) sexual vocabulary users to be funny. Not surprisingly, he does not contemplate humour among Roman sexual vocabulary coiners: nevertheless, the metaphorical use, from Plautus onwards, of *testis* - originally **tri-stis*, a word for the 'third party' (and independently applied to witnesses as well) - for the testicles would itself seem to be a joke (whether or not this term is additionally being employed in a pun on *testis*, 'witness'), cf. the discussion in Walde-Hofmann³, II.676-7, a point I owe to William M. Calder III).

Adams' harsh tone, as Howell also indicates, is particularly noticeable when he takes issue with other scholars. The Adams (often Latinate) critical vocabulary abounds in such lexical items as 'inaccurate' (p.1), 'implausible' (p.29), 'absurd' (pp.71, 100 & 172), 'unconvincing' (pp.86 & 210), 'does nothing to elucidate the problem' (p.125), 'can be disregarded' (p.130), 'far fetched' (p.171), 'ludicrous' (p.210) and 'bizarre' (p.211). Quite often this vocabulary is found in footnotes, where (and so that?) Adams need not 'back up [his dismissive attitude] with facts and an argument' (the quote is from a seminal new article by a fellow American classicist in the *Chronicle for Higher Education* 25.20 [January 26, 1983], 72, 'Semantics and Symbioses: How to Write an Article to Impress Your Peers', by Marleen B. Flory: cf. her further remarks on footnotes: 'The first footnote should include a summary of all prior work on spigots. It is important to destroy the validity of other scholarly work in order to validate your own' ... 'Subsequent footnotes are also the place for personal attacks on other scholars, because you need to back up your point of view in the text.').

Quite often its targets are the few Americans toiling in his, and to them culturally alien, scholarly vineyard (such as J. Henderson, whose *Maculate Muse* Adams calls 'so inaccurate that I have chosen not to refer to it' in a note on p.1 only to cite one of its arguments as 'unconvincing, on the evidence offered', in a note 85 pages later). Your reviewer was flattered to be challenged in Adams' text itself (pp.209-11) and hence accorded the same locale as Housman (pp.171-2); more flattering still is Adams' reference to her (both there and on p.100 n.1) by her given name rather than initials - which he uses for virtually every other scholar he mentions, including Alfred E. Housman [*the Editor should here point out that this does appear to be a case of cross-cultural misunderstanding: to use only initials except for women has always been the English custom (cf. our use of the bare surname among peers - and Peers -) and was adopted for both sexes by LCM - only some English scholars now prefer - or insist - on first names, and the Editor is now more indulgent. But the use of Housman's first name seems to English ears almost obscene*]. Yet one wonders if such strong language is really necessary, in the spirit of the scholarly dialectic which nourishes all classicists on both sides of both oceans, and in the face of the likelihood that new work on diverse texts may alter their interpretation. Adams' own experience in this very journal should be instructive on this latter score. In Vol.7.6 (June 1981), p.86, he dismissed as 'odd' your reviewer's straight-forward interpretation of an inscription likening a male ordered *cunnu(m) lingere* to a *canis*, claiming that the presence of a male name in the inscription 'shows that cunnilingus is not at issue'. In Vol.7.10 (Dec.1981), p.150 he asked that his earlier remarks on this matter be disregarded, since the inscription, now correctly read, clearly enjoins from cunnilingus (of wall-painted girls) a man called a *canis*. And even when Adams has better grounds for criticizing fellow scholars, he owes it to them to give these grounds, and to represent both their arguments and the evidence supporting such arguments correctly.

This Adams often neglects to do. Your reviewer's (to Adams 'absurd') notion that *os* and *labra* at Martial 1.83.1 may indicate parts of the female pudenda does not posit that 'Martial based a pun on an obscene medical calque which is only attested in a very late translation': it adduces Martial's own use, at 3.72.5 (*aut aliquid cunni prominet ore tui*), of *os* to denote the external female genitalia. The long-lived European view that *passer* in Catullus 2 and 3 signifies the *membrum virile* does not necessarily stipulate that Catullus intended such an interpretation (as Adams says on p.32), merely that Catullus' *passer* was so regarded by the early Imperial era. While Adams' reference to a 1980 article by his colleague H.D. Jocelyn to some extent excuses his failure to be convinced by this view, he might also have considered evidence in favour of the 'obscene' interpretation which Jocelyn omits: e.g. the poems by Martial cited in Howell's review; *Priapea* 83.19 (addressing an impotent organ with *o scelestae penis, o meum malum* and hence 'echoing' Catullus 3.16); Suetonius, *Tiberius* 44-45 (which describes *fellatio* and cunnilingus with such words from Catullus 2 as *ludere, morsus* and *adpetens*, and which also makes reference to Atalanta's amours); the echo of Catullus 3.12 at CE 1504.11-12 (a poem addressed to Priapus, and seeking oral ministrations to the god's groin).

In your reviewer's attempt to explain the *turbari* of *masturbari* as derived from *turbari*, 'to be agitated so as to affect the agitator', rather than *stuprare*, 'to disgrace' (someone else), her reasons for rejecting the latter are hardly 'bizarre' (pp.210-11): *turbari* and *stuprare* are the exact same word; the act in question is an agitating self-directed one; ancient Roman references to orgasmic penile self-arousal do not seriously brand the practice as disgraceful. Your reviewer does not, moreover, classify *emasculare* as 'a direct derivative of *mas*' (but as 'of course, formed from *e-* plus the adjective *masculus*'; exactly what Adams himself insists it is). Nor does she say that 'in compounds in which *man-* is instrumental it shows a *-u-* or *-i-* before the second element' (just that it does so in those ablative-style compounds displaying an *-n-* that she cites; Adams' analogy of **subs-capio* > *suscipio* would not satisfactorily explain **manstuprare* > *masturbari* either, as both labial *b* and nasal *n* are retained when they combine finally in prefix with *st*, and *n* - unlike *b* at times - does not disappear before *sc*).

By focussing first on the *mas* in *masturbari*, and defending *mas* = *man-* as 'morphologically plausible' and 'semantically attractive', Adams not only misrepresents your reviewers argument (which focuses first on the *turbari*, then tries to establish that 'the identification of *mas* with *manus* is far from assured', and lastly speculates on what the syllable *mas* 'might ... possibly mean'). He also manifests a confused and excessive concern with the hand and its role in sexual activity. Adams has arbitrarily decided to employ the English word 'masturbate', its Latin meaning notwithstanding, for any manual excitation of the genitalia, one's own or others' (so pp.184ff. and especially 208ff.). While modern English usage (according to both American and British dictionaries) may sanction this decision, Adams should still distinguish, as the Romans did, a) a male's manual arousal to erection from a male's manual arousal to ejaculation (of his own organ);

108 b) a woman's manual arousal to erection from a woman's manual arousal to ejaculation (of a male's organ), and both of these from the acts in a); c) a male's manual arousal of a woman's clitoris from the acts in a) and b). As it is, he leaves the misleading impression that the Romans viewed as comparable phenomena pleasurable touching of the clitoris by a male lover (though not necessarily by hand) recommended by Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 2.719ff., the penile self-rubbing preparatory to displaying a huge erection aphoristically described at *Satyricon* 92.11, and the 'Portnoyesque whacking off' to orgasm by males without partners that is joked about at, e.g., Martial 9.41.

Arbitrary classification and confused argumentation detract from the usefulness of other discussions too: if Adams' first category of metaphors for *mentula* (pp.14ff.) is to include *columna*, and reflect the realities of ancient architecture, it should not be entitled 'sharp and pointed instruments'; if his seventh category of metaphors for *cunus* (p.89) were changed from 'doors and paths' to 'doors and openings', it could include the examples of *rima* and *hiatus* from the 'miscellaneous usages' section (pp.95-6). Under euphemisms for *mentula* (pp.44-7), Adams combines, as instances of 'specialization', a) usages of imprecise words strictly indicating other and/or larger bodily areas to refer to the sexual organs alone, and b) references to the whole person instead of the appropriate sexual part. Since all people, but not necessarily all bodily areas, have sexual organs, perhaps the term 'specialization' and its application to both categories of euphemism merit reconsideration. So as to dismiss yet another American scholar's remarks on the absence of weakening of primary obscenities, Adams insists (p.130) that a threat of future *irrumatio* cannot be deemed metaphoric in any circumstances whereas description of a past non-sexual act as *irrumatio* can: this is, as it were, difficult to swallow. Adams' concluding discussion of 'Sociolinguistic and contextual variation' (pp.215-6) confuses the issue of linguistic crudeness with that of Roman social class: to make his point better and more clearly, he should not only establish that elite Romans used obscenities, but also that Romans of the lower orders used metaphors and euphemisms for sexual parts and acts.

The larger social context of Latin sexual language gets specified as an implicit concern of Adams' book by his initial observation that study of sexual language can illuminate 'the tastes of the age'. American (and East German) scholarship on ancient sexual language has shown a strong interest in its social and attitudinal background: the enthusiastic reception of Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* by non-classicists as well as classicists in the country may suggest that this interest also has its roots in the national character. See, for example, Lawrence Stone's praise of Dover as a model for modern social historians to emulate, in the *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 12(1981), 51ff.. The East German scholarship on ancient sexual language referred to is of course that of Werner Krenkel, whose 1979 article on 'Masturbation in der Antike' to have been cited by Adams too.

Whatever the cause of this interest, Adams' failure to utilize the data he has gathered and conclusions he has drawn for constructing a larger social and attitudinal framework disappoints your reviewer the most. No effort, for example, is made to explain why female *fellatio* (and by Adams' interpretation *irrumatio*) is portrayed less negatively than male oral exertions on a masculine member. Admittedly, the association of *fellatio* with physically deteriorating women - on Greek vases and in apparent jokes about the lack of suction power in senescent female mouths (e.g. *Priapea* 12.9-10) - permits us to infer its characteristic practice by women whose failing charms could not by themselves stir partners to erection and ejaculation. Yet evidence such as Suetonius, *Tiberius* 45, and Martial 9.40 and 11.46 and 51, also demonstrates that men, especially aging ones and/or those plagued with erectory inadequacies, needed and welcomed such stimulation. Similarly Adams notes the virtual equation, through similar metaphoric description, of *fututio* and *pedicatio*, and even of the *cunus* and the *culus* (and would regard the former as a metaphor for the latter). He also notes (e.g. p.111) that female as well as male *culi* are depicted as sexual apertures. But he does not ponder why heterosexual and homosexual sodomy were viewed as similar, and both acts likened to intra-vaginal penetration: surely the fact that many of the sexual activities our Roman sources describe are of a contraceptive (or at least non-conceptive) nature has some significance, and warrants discussion.

So does the phallogentric nature of Roman sexual description and assumption. The Roman identification of sexuality with male genital activity and pleasure is documented time and time again in the varied (and mostly male-authored) Latin texts that Adams cites, and by diverse observations Adams makes: e.g. that abstract nouns such as *amor* and *venus* denote the *mentula* (but apparently not the *cunus*) (p.51); that vaginal laxity is a common topic of obscene invective (p.96); that popular parlance often made no 'rigid' (so Adams p.103) distinction between womb, vagina and external pudenda; that *patrare*, literally meaning 'to act like a father', also signifies 'to reach orgasm' (pp.142-3). Even depictions of women who seek sexual pleasure with one another ascribe to them male phallic activity (so p.122, noting *fututor* at Martial 1.90 and *ineo* at Seneca, *Epistles* 95.21; cf. also *pedicat* at Martial 7.67); so too on p.97 Adams remarks that the clitoris, source of autonomous female sexual pleasure, is likened to the *mentula* (*nasus* = clitoris at *Priapea* 12.4 and *aliquid* at Martial 3.72.5 also deserve attention in this context, inasmuch as Adams points out the connexion between the penis and the nose on p.35, and the employment of neuter pronouns to denote the male organ on p.62). Adams' comment on the sexual vocabulary of Roman elegy - 'that those metaphors which focus attention on the role of the *mentula* are avoided' (p.224) - merits special reflexion in the light of this phallogentricity. This phallogentric view of Roman sexuality would, moreover, alone account for the greater Latin linguistic and humorous interest in the penis than in the female pudenda which Adams observes on pp.77-9 - and do so just as well as Adams' own theory that the male organ was less shameful than the female.

The above comments, for Adams to keep in mind when preparing a second edition of *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, are in no way meant to detract from the monumentally impressive accomplishment that this edition represents. Adams' learning is as vast as the quantity and variety of data he has compiled, and the entire classical world is deeply in his debt. It is hoped, however, that he will better heed the expectations, justifiably great in his case, of his audience in this part of the world: in turn he can expect a response from serious readers no less enthusiastic than that which he has already elicited from curious browsers.

Review: H.D. JOCELYN (Manchester)

LCM 8.7 (Jul. 1983) 109-110 109

Milan, Università degli Studi di Milano, Istituto di Filologia Classica, *Scripta Philologica III*, Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino - La Goliardica, Milan 1982, pp. 241, tabb. 9, paper. Price L. 18,000

This volume belongs to a genre blessed by scholars seeking a public and at the same time cursed by those who feel constrained to keep up with the literature of their subject; a genre whose representatives tend either to escape the attention of book-orderers or, if ordered, to disappear in the intricacies of the ordering library's catalogue. Reviews seldom appear. Not surprisingly. A book written by a team needs another team to assess properly its worth, and reviewers tend to be persons averse to team games. This reviewer is as suspicious of the genre as he is of that of the *Festschrift*, and could not pretend to be able to judge the extent of the contribution made to scholarship by *Scripta Philologica III* as a whole. He is, however, himself guilty of having contributed to a series of Liverpuddlian (or should it be 'Lerpulan'?) [*Lerpolitian is generally considered classier, if Lerpolitian has a better sound.* Ed.] representatives of the genre, and wishes to report that the Milanese volume contains items which will interest and instruct readers of *LCM* even when they do not entirely persuade. It testifies to an enviable vitality in the more serious areas of classical study in Milan.

The predecessors of *Scripta Philologica III* came out in 1977 and 1980. No individual's name appears on the title page. The preface is signed by Alberto Grilli and Isabella Gualandri as joint heirs, so to speak, of Ignazio Cazzaniga, a remarkable man of wide but deeply studied interests who presided for years over the Institute of Classical Philology in the state University of Milan (+ 25 July 1974) and encouraged the researches of many younger persons. The seven contributors to *Scripta Philologica III* are all either pupils of Cazzaniga or pupils of his pupils. It has not been necessary to conscript outsiders. They share a common down to earth spirit. Although four of them are female, modern feminism does not raise its unpreggy head. The structuralist and genericist plagues which rage in some university cities of Italy do not seem to have affected Milan, I detect only one sanitized reference (on p. 216): '*si può, ad esempio, focalizzare l'attenzione sul "codice espressivo" dei vari generi letterari di cui Claudiano si serve.*'.

Four contributions are to do with Latin literary texts and the genesis of their subject matter. Alberto Grilli's *Cultura e filosofia nel proemio della 'Catalinaria' di Sallustio* (pp. 133-166) makes Sallust a pupil of the philosopher Antiochus of Ascalon, and derives the totality of the argument of *Catil.* 1-2 from Antiochus' teaching. Giampera Arrigoni's *Alla ricerca della meter Tebana e dei ueteres di* (pp. 7-68) detects behind Ovid's account of how Cybele punished Hippomenes and Atalanta for copulating in her precinct (*Met.* 10.681-707; on the offence see *LCM* 6.2 [Feb. 1981], 45-46) a post-Hesiodic Greek tale involving Demeter and the Theban Kabereion. Isabella Gualandri's *Note ad Avieno, Descriptio Orbis* (pp. 167-178) develops the view that the substance of the *Descriptio orbis terrae* of Avienus depends not only on the text of Dionysius' *Περὶ ἡγεσις* but also on a learned commentary attached to this text (see now also Gualandri's *Avieno e Dionisio il Periegeta in Studi in onore di A. Colonna*, Perugia 1982, pp. 151-165). Brunella Moroni's *Tradizione letteraria e propaganda: osservazioni sulla poesia politica di Claudiano* (pp. 213-239) argues that the classical models of Claudian's poems about Stilicho and Honorius condition their political content, that what contemporary persuasive power these poems exercised derived from the ideology about Rome's place in the world which late fourth century men of letters found in the classics and from the way in which Claudian associated his patrons with this ideology.

The other three contributions have a more basically philological concern.

Luigi Lehnus addresses himself (pp. 179-211) to the set of essays on Virgilian problems attributed to the first century grammarian M. Valerius Probus in a codex of the monastery of St Columban at Bobbio, a codex to which a number of fifteenth century humanists had access, which Giorgio Merula removed from the monastery in 1493 and which Gio. Battista Egnazio used as the basis of his 1507 Venice edition. The codex has disappeared, and we have to rely on the 1507 edition and a number of descendants of a lost fifteenth century apograph. The latter was marked not only by inaccuracy but also by interpolation. The text printed in 1507 puts Virgil's birthplace only three miles from Mantova, as did common opinion in Egnazio's time. Most nineteenth and twentieth century scholars have wanted to put this place much further away, and, since the lost apograph made the distance thirty miles, the topic of how faithfully Egnazio's edition reproduced the ancient codex has been much debated by persons not usually interested in such topics. Lehnus points out that Egnazio's text of 'Probus' note on *Georg.* 3.6 *cui non Hylas puer et Latonia Delos* attempts to emend a nonsensical passage accurately reported by the other branch of the tradition. This emboldens him to present a new text of 'Probus' account of Virgil's life, consciously diverging in a number of places from Egnazio's.

Mario Geymonat discusses (pp. 119-130) two uncial codices of the sixth century, remnants of which were preserved in Bobbio and utilized in the ninth and tenth centuries for the fly-leaves and bindings of new codices. One had originally carried the orations of Cassiodorus, the other the vulgate translation of St Paul's epistles. Seven folia of the former perished in the fire which destroyed the Turin library in 1904, an eighth is still preserved in Nancy, while the Ambrosian library in Milan possesses a bifolium used to reinforce the binding of a collection of papal canons and decrees and a folium used as the front and back fly-leaves of a collection of works by St. Jerome and Augustine. To the same Milan library belong strips from two folia of the St Paul codex used in the manufacture of the binding of a homiliary. Geymonat has succeeded in reading more of the contents of the Milan fragments than previous students have done.

Eleonora Coltri surveys (pp. 71-118) the many post-Carolingian codices which carry the life of St Genevieve. The original version of this life was composed at the beginning of the sixth century in sub-standard Latin closer to that of the vulgate Bible than to that of Cassiodorus' orations. Two revisions of the Life gained currency, one attempting to correct the language, the other making changes of substance as well as of style. Coltri has examined codices neglected by previous editors and presents an account of how all the extant witnesses to the three redactions of the work are related.

Scripta Philologica III is on the whole well produced. The editors seem to have intended to set all notes at the foot of the relevant page instead of massing them at the end of a contribution. Unfortunately, where the very rich notes composed by Arrigoni were concerned, the intention was not executed. The editors' hearts, however, were in the right place. This cannot be said about those Anglo-Saxons who exploit the economic crisis

in order to make war on the foot-note. The cover displays a fifth century B.C. Etruscan sketch of the Amazon Penthesilea on her knees being held up by Greek heroes Diomedes and Odysseus. It is a fine sketch but I cannot myself see what it has to do with the contents or spirit of the volume.

A *Scripta Philologica* IV will not be unwelcome. Its genre has the advantage over the annual and the monthly in that publication can await the arrival of sufficient worthwhile material. It is also to be hoped that the promises of new editions of 'Probus' *commentarii*, Avienus' *Descriptio orbis terrae* and the *Vita Genovefae uirginis Parisiensis* dangled in *Scripta Philologica* III will not turn out to be sailors' promises.

Copyright (C) H.D.Jocelyn

Review: TOM RASMUSSEN (Manchester)

LCM 8.7 (Jul. 1983), 110

Larissa Bonfante, *Out of Etruria. Etruscan influence North and South* (BAR International Series 103), Oxford 1981. Pp. 173, 10 maps, 122 figs. Buckram, price £10.00.

'To those who like me dislike the Etruscans, it is a grief that we should have got our alphabet through them; for myself I think it would have been better without their share in it' (Sir Ellis Minns). *Out of Etruria* is a refreshingly sober treatment of a theme that should be of importance to classicists, for what is involved is the impact of basically Greek ideas on non-Greek peoples in the West, and the development of early Rome. Four chapters are concerned with the Iron Age art of the *situla* people in N. Italy and the Alpine regions, including a discussion of the Corsini throne in Rome, and three deal with linguistic affinities of Etruria and adjacent areas (the last two chapters are by Giuliano Bonfante).

Disparagement of the Etruscans (the opening quotation is from the preface to D. Diringer, *The Alphabet*, 1948) has been due mainly to their being judged by the standards of Greek culture, many of the forms of which they admired and adopted for themselves. They were also transmitters of these ideas to their neighbours in Italy and further afield, and this book is very much about the process of transmission, a process which can sometimes be traced through at least four stages: Near East - Greece - Etruria - N. Italy - Celtic Europe. Take one example discussed (pp. 70-71), a common motif in archaic Etruria is that of a lion devouring a human leg, an idea that is taken up in *situla* art, and in turn, with some variation, in such Celtic work as the Tarasque de Noves. L.B. mentions the Near Eastern prototypes, but here as so often the Etruscans may have borrowed from Greece (for discussion see Szilágyi, *SE* 16 [1958], 276-7), for a similar - though not identical - motif is found on Boeotian engraved fibulae (the clearest example is R. Hampe, *Frühe griechische Sagenbilder in Böotien*, 1936, pl. 10.64), where it seems to be a variation of the common Greek Orientalizing theme of a man or animal being torn apart by two lions.

The chapters on the art of the *situlae*, with their rich documentation, make an excellent introduction to the subject, and are the only up-to-date treatment on this scale in English. Some details of this art are clearly local, as has been pointed out before, such as the 'dumb-bell knuckledusters' used by boxers, and the iconography of lovemaking scenes where the couple is almost always shown lying on a bed with the man on top - in contrast with the more variable positions seen on Athenian vase-painting. But the borrowings from Etruria are many, and L.B. shows, in particular through careful examination of the recent finds from Murlo, that it is with the region of Chiusi in N. Etruria that the similarities are closest especially in matters of dress (in which she is an expert) and furniture. Of equal interest are the things not transmitted northwards from Etruria. Greek mythology is the prime example. Etruscan art shows thorough knowledge of it; and it is becoming increasingly obvious that Etruscan divergence from the known Greek account is due in many cases not to negligence or misunderstanding but to a reworking of the myth in Etruria, a point well brought out recently in N.T. De Grummond, ed., *A Guide to Etruscan Mirrors*, 1982, esp. pp. 89-128. But although *situla* art does show an interest in mythological creatures - centaurs, sphinxes and the like, one looks in vain for actual scenes of myth. It is clear that the attitude to mythological narrative marks a major dividing line between the art of Etruria and the arts of the *situla* people and Barbarian Europe north of the Alps.

Turning to Rome, L.B. emphasizes the parallels between early Roman society, before it adopted a Greek Etruscan veneer, and the sort of 'proto-urban' society shown on the *situlae*, to which the marble Corsini Throne, a Roman product of the first century B.C., harks back both in its shape and its relief scenes. The crucial period of Etruscan influence at Rome is the sixth century, when, among many borrowings, the Romans adopted from the Etruscans not only many of the features of that most important ritual, the triumph (as discussed by L.B. in *JRS* 60 [1960], 57), but also, it is here argued, the very word for the ceremony itself.

The work ends with two chapters by G.B., the first offering handy thumbnail sketches of the various languages of the *situla* people, usefully summarizing the longer discussions in *Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia antica* 6, 1978. The second considers the process whereby the Etruscan alphabet became, via Raetic and Venetic, the inspiration for the runic letters of the Germanic peoples. The actual mechanics of the argument are not laid bare here, and there is no discussion of the Raetic letter-forms, such as † for t and ^ for u, which are its linch-pin. One of the first classical archaeologists to accept the thesis was Rhys Carpenter, whose perceptive article in *AJA* 49 (1945), 452-464, is not mentioned in the notes or bibliography.

Most of the chapters have appeared before in article form, and some have been translated from the Italian; to have them all together in English is most useful. Inevitably there are some overlappings and shifts of emphasis between them. Pp. 48 and 124-5 state simply that the Romans got their alphabet from the Etruscans, but p. 101 n. 2 admits the possibility that the process may have been more complex (for further discussion along these lines see M. Devine, *Orbis* 20 [1971], 347-355, who still concedes, however, that the Etruscan component is the basic one - as opposed to the Greek). In the Introduction p. 8 the implication seems to be that the Etruscans brought about 'the earliest civilizing of Europe, long before that of the Greeks and Romans', which is, at the least, questionable. Perhaps one should not complain that the story of direct Greek contact with Celtic/Barbarian Europe through Massalia and the head of the Adriatic figures not at all in this book, for it is not its subject, and yet it needs to be borne in mind.

The book contains many other ideas and arguments besides those mentioned here; some are controversial, all of them stimulating. It is well produced and very well illustrated. One is grateful to the Bonfantes for writing so readably on such important matters, and to BAR for its enterprise.

Copyright (C) 1983 Tom Rasmussen

ROBIN OSBORNE(King's College, Cambridge): Beans mean ... (Τηλεμάχου χύτρα)

LCM 8.7(Jul.1983), 111 111

Telemakhos son of Theangelos of the deme of Akharnai is a figure known to us from two very different kinds of source: Athenaeus 407d-408a preserves a little cache of quotations from the comedies of Timokles about Telemakhos, pots and beans, in order to explain the proverbial phrase Τηλεμάχου χύτρα, and the epigraphical evidence from late 4th century Athens preserves his name in three places. IG 2².360 is the record of a decision to honour Herakleides of Salamis for his assistance in providing corn to Athens: Telemakhos is the man responsible for having the boule draft an honorific decree, and when the proposal comes before the assembly he proposes an amendment; IG 2².3207 has Telemakhos recorded as one of many proposing honours for a man who is probably Lykourgos; *Hesperia* 5(1936), 402, no.10 lines 151-2, has Telemakhos purchase a confiscated sunoikia for 3,705 dr. 2 obols.

In order to explain why Telemakhos was the butt of jokes about beans and a χύτρα Wilamowitz invoked the epigraphic evidence. He suggested that in the famine of the early 320s Telemakhos made a name for himself by his proposals about the Athenian diet: '*audire mihi videor Telemachum, stultum oratorem, quales multi tunc rem publicam pessum dabant, gravissimis verbis famelicos cives exhortantem, ut maiorum temperantiam imitati ad χυτράν Chytorum et κιάμους Pyanopsiorum redirent*' (*Commentariolum Grammaticum* IV, p.24). Wilamowitz' proposal was enthusiastically taken up by Dittenberger (ap. SIG³.304) and RE s.v. *Telemakhos*, but it is, of course, quite silly.

Pulses were grown and were eaten, of that there is no question: the *Iliad* provides an image of the threshing of κιάμοι μελανόχροες ἢ ἐρέβινθοι (13.589), and there is literary and epigraphical evidence for the use of beans as an intermediate crop in the classical period (IG 2².2493, Theophrastus, *HP* 8.7.2). However, the idea that changing to eating beans instead of corn could solve the problem of a famine is totally unrealistic: condition which decimate yields of wheat and barley are hardly going to leave the barns full of beans.

So what is Timokles' joke? Readers of Aristophanes, from the Lexicographers to modern commentators, have been in no doubt about the meaning of eating beans in Aristophanes: (in order of increasing length and inaccuracy) Photius s.v. κιαμοτρώξ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν ταῖς ψήφοις κιάμου: Hesychios s.v. κιαμοτρώξ, ἐν ταῖς διαψηφίσεσι κιάμοις ἐχρῶντο καὶ ἐλάγχανον κιάμῳ, καὶ τοὺς τὸν λευκὸν κιάμον λαβόντας εἰληχέναι ἐνόμιζον: Souda s.v. κιαμοτρώξ, ὁ δικαστής, τρεφόμενος ὑπὸ κιάμων. πρὸ γὰρ τῆς εὐρέσεως τῶν ψήφων κιάμοις ἐχρῶντο ἐν ταῖς χειροτονίαις τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ὡς οὖν τῶν ψηφίζοντων ἀργύριον λαμβανόντων καὶ χειροτονούντων τοὺς δίδοντας πλέον. καὶ αὖθις κρινεῖ δὲ τούτους οὐ κιαμοτρώξ Ἀττικὸς. In Aristophanes, *Knights* 40-43 the political reference is hardly hidden:

νῦν γὰρ ἐστὶ δεσποτὴς
ἄγρικοις ὄργην κιαμοτρώξ ἀναρχολός,
ἄῤῃμος πυκνότης, δύσκολον γερόντιον
ὑπόκωρον.

Lysistrata 537 is a more complex case where the political significance of beans simply adds a twist to the command to the Proboules, and where the use of beans in the courts may be particularly important.

The use of beans for allotment seems to have been a particular Athenian characteristic, but this does not prevent later writers from generalizing. In particular there is a line found in Plutarch (*Mor.* 12e-f, *περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς*), Hippolytus (*Refutatio* 6.27.5) and Lucian (*Vit. Auct.* 6), which connects the Pythagorean prohibition on beans with their political significance: abstinence from beans is abstinence from politics.

Telemakhos, known as a political activist, as Timokles himself stresses (ὁ δ' Ἀχαρνικὸς Τηλέμαχος ἐστὶ δημηγορεῖ, Athenaeus 407e), is alleged to eat a lot of beans. This would seem to fit the Aristophanic model well, but there are problems. The first is an historical one: in the 4th century allotment machines came in for the appointment of certain magistracies, and while 5th century sources use the verb κιαμεῖν regularly of allotment, 4th century writers use κληροῦν (on all this see Rhodes [1981] *Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenion Politeia*, pp.149 & 690f.). However, beans may still have been used for the more simple allotments, the word may have appeared in the Heliastic oath (as it does in the dubious version at Demosthenes 24.149ff.), and the *AthPol*'s own use shows that the word was still understood (8.1). Nevertheless, the lessened use of beans in politics in the late 4th century does mean that Telemakhos' political activity is unlikely to be enough in its own right to have him identified as a bean-eater. The key to the association lies in the second problem.

This problem is the fact that central to the jokes about beans is Telemakhos' χύτρα. Eustathius' explanation of this proverb in terms of Telemakhos' poverty (1394.26) must be wrong, in view of his purchase of the sunoikia, and shows that the explanation of the phrase had not descended with it. Athenaeus' quotations of Timokles only give further data for the association, they do not explain it. There is no evidence that the χύτρα, although a multi-purpose vessel, had any political role, but it certainly had a religious one. Again it is Aristophanes who can be of assistance, for in three places (*Peace* 923f., *Plutus* 1197ff., fr.245) the comedies attest an association between χύτρα and the setting up of a religious image or altar. The scholiasts fill out the point: (Schol. *Plut.* 1197) ἐπειδὴ ὅποτε μέλλοιεν βαιμοὺς ἀριδρῶναι ἢ ἀγαλμα θεοῦ, ἔχοντες ὁπρία ἀπὸρχοντο τούτων τοῖς ἀριδρῶμένοις εὐχαριστήρια ἀπονέμοντας τῆς πρώτης διαίτης· ὅθεν καὶ ἐν ταῖς Δαναΐσι· 'μαρτύρομαι δὲ Ζηνὸς ἐρκείου χύτρας | παρ' αἷς ὁ βαιμὸς οὗτος ἰδρῶση ποτέ'. There is no evidence for Telemakhos Theangelou taking part in the setting up of any altars or images, but we do know one fact about his grandfather, also called Telemakhos: there is ample epigraphic evidence (IG 2².4355, 4960-61) that he was the man who set up the first altar to Asklepios in Athens.

In the light of all this it becomes plausible that the phrase Τηλεμάχου χύτρα was first coined with reference to Telemakhos' grandfather, and grew out of some incident at the setting up of the altar to Asklepios. Timokles, in the later 4th century, will then have taken advantage of the phrase to jest at Telemakhos' expense, making play with the political overtones still felt with κιάμος. The famine of the 320s may have lent force to the suggestion that Telemakhos actually ate (allotment) beans (certainly the lines πρὸς δὲ τὸν χρηστὸν δρομῶν | Τηλέμαχον Ἀχαρνέα σαρὸν τε κιάμων καταλαβὼν | ἀρπάζας τούτων ἐνέτραγον make play on the substitution of κιάμων for the πυρῶν expected with σαρὸς) but there is hardly a political programme behind this. The epigraphic evidence can assist our reading of these comic fragments, but it is as well not to jump to conclusions. We must beware of Wilamowitz' rhetoric, which is as windy as Telemakhos', and keep our fingers on the pulse of Athenian life.

Lykourgos talks about the strictness of old time justice with regard to traitors. You will read in published texts that Hipparchos son of Charmos did not stay around to face trial for treason before the demos and incurred a death sentence; not having him to punish, they removed his bronze statue from the Akropolis and melted it down to make a stele, upon which they voted should be inscribed the names of ἀλιτρίοι and πρόδοται. Lykourgos then has read the decree under which the statue was removed, the subscript of the stele and the names subsequently inscribed.

Lykourgos is the only source for this, but that need not worry us; he is clearly dealing with matters of fact. And the information can be set in historical context. Here is the first man ostracized (in 488/7), a relative of the tyrant house and so suspected of treasonable relations with Persia, of which the demos considered him guilty. Whether or not there is a confusion with Hipparchos' ostracism, which seems unlikely, the words ἀλιτρίος and πρόδοτης do occur on ostraka of the period (refs. in Rhodes' commentary on *AthPol*, p.282).

So in general modern assessment of Lykourgos' evidence. And Harpokration, s.v. Ἱππάρχος, cites the passage for the son of Charmos, followed by a reference to Androtion on ostracism. But the MSS of Lykourgos have τὸν Τιμάρχου. Dindorf noted this in his edition of Harpokration in 1853, supposing confusion on the part of Harpokration or his conjectural source, Didymus. Kenyon too, in his 3rd edition of the *AthPol* stressed the actual reading in Lykourgos (p.73 on 22.4). But a year later, in 1893, Wilamowitz (*Aristoteles und Athen* I.114 n.27) proclaimed the acceptance of Timarchos insufferable, pointing to Harpokration's citation for confirmation of Charmos as the true father.

Nowadays the matter seems unquestioned and Lykourgos is cited for Hipparchos son of Charmos. But we should not surrender Timarchos' paternity without a fight. The choice is between legal proceedings against a known figure on an unknown occasion (for the concrete - and bronze- nature of Lykourgos' evidence tells against confusion with ostracism) or against an otherwise unknown figure on an unspecified occasion. The choice is wide open.

On purely formal grounds it is perhaps not hard to see how τὸν χάριου could be corrupted into τὸν Τιμάρχου before the surviving manuscript tradition. But a scribe or scholar would not be likely to alter a character known even to us from a number of citations into one less notorious - even though the son of Timarchos may have been better known than the surviving evidence indicates. So the corruption can only be ascribed to carelessness, but it is more difficult to credit carelessness which not only transposes two letters but adds two. Funny things do sometimes happen to names in texts, but my feeling is that they are usually more easily explained than this case.

And Harpokration's reading of Lykourgos' text can very likely have been wrong, especially if the son of Charmos was better known to history and to Harpokration (who cites Androtion on the man). But he may not have consulted the text of Lykourgos himself, and we may transfer our remarks to his source - perhaps Didymus, but it is not important who it was. For in a world of scholarship which was quite capable of confusing homonyms, distorting relationships and identities, and misquoting or wrongly attributing references to earlier works, the well-attested son of Charmos could easily have been read into or instead of the son of Timarchos.

The word ἀλιτρίος may tempt us back to the world of ostracism in the 480s and associated events: πρόδοτης in itself leads nowhere in particular. But ἀλιτρίος is not confined to the early 5th century, and is surely part of a conventional vocabulary of condemnation.

Lykourgos seems to have expected his audience to be familiar with the case of Hipparchos; indeed, the bronze stele was a perpetual monument to his infamy, and there was no need to specify the details of the treason. It is not easy for us to argue a particular context for the condemnation, and it cannot be assumed that a series of examples in such a work must be chronologically connected. But it does seem to me that what Lykourgos regards as the 'good old days' for the treatment of traitors are here concentrated on the late 5th century. We may recall that his father was killed under the Thirty ([Plutarch], *Mor.* 841b, *Vit. orat.*, *Lyc.* 1). Beginning at §112 Lykourgos uses the example of Phrynichos in 411: then follows that of Hipparchos, 117-119, after which he calls for καὶ τὸ ἕτερον ψήφισμα περὶ τῶν εἰς Δεκέλειαν μεταστάντων, ὅτε ὁ δῆμος ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἐπολιορκεῖτο, ὅπως εἰδῶσιν ὅτι περὶ τῶν προδοτῶν οἱ πρόγονοι ὁμοίας καὶ ἀνοήτους ἀλλήλαις τὰς τιμωρίας ἐποιούντο, 120. At 121 he contrasts the treatment of these people, τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ χώρᾳ μεταστάντας, with what is deserved by Leocrates, who fled to Rhodes.

Lykourgos returns to the same historical context in 124-127, when he cites the decree of Demophantos περὶ τῶν προδοτῶν καὶ τῶν τὸν δῆμον καταλύοντων, actually passed in 410, but which he, presumably because of its content, misattributes to the period μετὰ τοὺς τριάκοντα (124), which does not inspire confidence in his accuracy. Before that, however, it must be admitted that he does cite a decree that is firmly placed in 479 - τοῦ περὶ τοῦ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι τελευτήσαντος γενομένου ψήφισματος, ὃν ἡ βουλὴ, ὅτι λόγῳ μόνον ἐνεχείρει προδιδόναι τὴν πόλιν, περιελομένη τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτοχειρὶ ἀπέκτεινεν. This clearly refers to the stoning of Lykides recounted at Herodotus 9.5 (there is uncertainty about his name too, for Demosthenes 18.204 calls him Kyrtilos: see How & Wells ad loc.). It may be felt that this reference invalidates the contextual argument that I have set out for placing Hipparchos in the late 5th century, though I am inclined to feel that this example can be taken apart from the others. On the other hand, it may perhaps be doubted whether a bronze stele would have survived the capture of Athens by the Persians - unless we are to suppose that the condemnation of Hipparchos took place after his return from ostracism, thus in the 470s.

The purpose of these speculations is to show that, even if there is no historically conclusive argument in favour of the late fifth century Hipparchos son of Timarchos, nor is there for the early fifth century Hipparchos son of Charmos as the subject of Lykourgos reference here. One cannot depend on the reference of Harpokration when Timarchos is unchallenged in the manuscripts of Lykourgos, and in view of the common tendency to assimilate less well known bearers of a name to a better known one. We need a better reason than any that has yet been provided why Timarchos should have found his way into the text if he did not belong there.